IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS Springfield Division

FM ED SLIGHTS IN ER

NICHOLAS J. MCGRATH 219 Lower Gore Road Webster, MA 01570

JURY TRIAL DEMANDEDS, DISTRICT COURT

Plaintiff

VS.

i

CONSOLIDATED RAIL CORPORATION Two Commerce Square 2001 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19101

05-30048-MAP

CIVIL ACTION

and

CSX TRANSPORTATION INC. 3800 Centre Square West Philadelphia, PA 19102

FILING **FEE PAID:**

RECEIPT # 305858

AMOUNT \$ 250.00

BY DPTY CLK MGA

DATE 2/11/05

Defendants

NO.

COMPLAINT

- 1. The Plaintiff, Nicholas J. McGrath, is a competent adult individual residing at 219 Lower Gore Road, Webster, Massachusetts 01570.
- 2. The Defendant, Consolidated Rail Corporation, is a corporation which is authorized to do and in fact does substantial business within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and whose principal place of business and address for service of process is Two Commerce Square, 2001 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101.

- 3. The Defendant, CSX Transportation Inc., is a corporation which is authorized to do and in fact does substantial business within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Virginia, and whose address for service of process is to John J. Barrett, Jr., Esquire, c/o Saul Ewing, 3800 Centre Square West, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102.
- 4. This suit is brought pursuant to an Act of Congress known as the Federal Employers' Liability Act, 45 U.S.C. §§51-60; the Federal Safety Appliance Acts, 45 U.S.C. §§1-16; and the Boiler Inspection Acts, 45 U.S.C.§§22-34.
- 5. At all times material hereto, the Defendant, Consolidated Rail Corporation, was engaged in interstate commerce as a common carrier by railroad operating a line and system of railroads in the State of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and other states of the United States.
- 6. At all times material hereto, the Defendant, CSX Transportation Inc., was engaged in interstate commerce as a common carrier by railroad operating a line and system of railroads in the State of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and other states of the United States.
- 7. At the time and place hereinafter mentioned, the acts of omission and commission causing injuries to the Plaintiff were done by the Defendants, their agents, servants, workmen and/or employees acting in the course and scope of their employment with and under the direct and exclusive control of the Defendants.
- 8. At the time and place hereinafter mentioned, the Plaintiff was employed by Defendant railroads and was acting in the scope of his employment by the Defendants and was engaged in the furtherance of interstate commerce within the meaning of the FELA.

- 9. All the property, equipment and operations involved in this occurrence hereinafter referred to were owned and/or under the direct and exclusive control of the Defendants, their agents, servants, workmen and/or employees.
- 10. The Plaintiff has been employed by the Defendants from 1976 through and including the present as a welder/welder foreman and, while working within the scope of his employment in and around West Springfield, Massachusetts was exposed to excessive and harmful cumulative trauma to his back and shoulders due to the bending, lifting, twisting and climbing and walking on ballast, with which he performed his work for the Defendant.
- 11. Less than three years before this action was filed, Plaintiff discovered that he suffered from occupational injuries as a result of repetitive occupational trauma to his back and shoulders, and until such time, Plaintiff was reasonably ignorant as to same.
- 12. The injuries and disabilities of the Plaintiff were caused by exposure to excessive repetitive trauma to his back and shoulders while working for the Defendant.
- 13. The aforesaid injuries were caused in whole or in part by the negligence, carelessness and recklessness of the Defendant and its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, acting within the scope of their employment, which negligence consisted of the following:
 - in failing to provide the Plaintiff with a safe place to work as required by the Federal Employers' Liability Act, 45 U.S.C. §§ 51-60;
 - (b) in failing to provide Plaintiff with timely and adequate ergonomics program to prevent repetitive trauma to his back and shoulders;

- Document 1
- in failing to provide Plaintiff with safe places to walk and with ballast of (c) proper size and properly maintained;
- in failing to periodically test employees such as the Plaintiff for physical (d) effects of repetitive trauma to the back and shoulders; and failing to take appropriate action, including advising Plaintiff as to the test results;
- in failing to exercise reasonable care to adequately warn Plaintiff of the (e) risks, dangers and harm to which he was exposed in working with and around repetitive trauma to his back and shoulders;
- in negligently requiring and/or allowing the Plaintiff to be exposed to (f) unsafe levels of repetitive trauma to the back and shoulders when it knew or should have known of the risks thereof;
- in negligently failing to inspect or monitor the occupational repetitive (g) trauma in the job duties where the Plaintiff was required to work;
- (h) in negligently failing to warn Plaintiff of the risk of repetitive trauma injuries as a result of exposure to repetitive occupational trauma to the back and shoulders;
- in negligently failing to provide the Plaintiff with protective equipment (i) designed to protect him from repetitive trauma injuries as a result of exposure to repetitive occupational trauma to the back and shoulders;
- in negligently failing to employ safe working practices; (j)

- (k) in negligently failing to promulgate, issue, circulate and/or enforce adequate safety rules regarding avoiding repetitive trauma injuries, especially those to the back and shoulders;
- (I) in negligently failing to modify or eliminate certain job duties, equipment or practices so as to minimize or eliminate the cumulative traumas to which the Plaintiff would be exposed.
- (m) in negligently failing to make reasonable efforts to ascertain the risks and hazards of repetitive trauma and repetitive trauma disorders;
- in negligently failing to monitor the Plaintiff's work habits to determine
 if his work activities placed him at risk of suffering a repetitive trauma
 injury; and,
- (o) in negligently failing to use due care and caution required under the circumstances.
- 14. As a direct result of the Defendant's negligence, through its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, the Plaintiff has been unable to attend to his usual duties and occupation, all of which caused substantial financial loss, wage loss, loss of future earning capacity, all of which will continue in the future.
- As a direct result of the Defendant's negligence, through its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, the Plaintiff has been and may continue to be required to receive and undergo medical treatment and medical care, has incurred reasonable and necessary medical expenses, all of which will continue in the future.

- As a direct result of the Defendant's negligence, through its agents, servants, 16. workmen and/or employees, the Plaintiff has sustained pain, suffering, inconvenience and a loss of enjoyment of life past, present and future.
- As a direct result of the Defendant's negligence through its agents, servants, 17. workmen and/or employees the Plaintiff has sustained permanent injury and disability to his back and shoulders. due to the repetitive climbing in/out of rail cars and continually walking on ballast, with which he performed his work for the Defendants.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, in an amount in excess of ONE HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$150,000.00).

Dated:

11

2/9/05

THOMAS J. JOYCE, III, ESQUIRE

Attorney for Maintiff

HANNON & JOYCE

Public Ledger Building - Suite 1000 150 S. Independence Mall West Philadelphia, PA 19106-3323 (215) 446-4460

LAWSON & WEITZEN, LLP

Dated:

MICHAEL J. MCDEVITT, ESQ., BBO #564720

Local Counsel for Plaintiff

88 Black Falcon Avenue, Suite 345

Boston, MA 02210 (617) 439-4990

SJS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Nicholas J 219 Lower Webster, M (b) County of Residence (E)	DEFENDANTS Consolidated Rail Corporation Two Commerce Square 2001 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19101 (see at County of Residence of First Listed (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.							
(c) HANNON & JOYCE The Public Ledger Bldg, 150 S. Independence N Philadelphia, PA 1910a (215) 446-4460 Attorney for Plaintiff	- Ste. 1000 88 Black Fa Mall West Suite 345 Boston, MA (617) 439- Local County		(Attorneys (If Kn		104	8 - MAP	
IL BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X	(" in O ne Box Only)	I. CITI	ZENSHIP OF P	RINC	PAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	•
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff			Citizen	versity Cases On ly) of This State	DE	and One Box for De fendant) DEF Principal Place		
Defendant		zenship of Parties	Citizen	of Another State			ad Principal Place 5 5 5 h Another State	
IV. NATURE OF SUI		O P O-1		or Subject of a ☐ ign Country	3 🗆	3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
CONTRACT		ORTS	FORF	CITURE/PENALTY	B.	ANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
110 Insurance 120 Marine 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of 150 Recovery of Defauked Student Loans (Excl. Veteans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airpfane 315 Airpfane Product Liability	PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury— Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury— Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal lajury Poduct Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS 510 Motions to Va cute Sentence Habeas Corpus: 335 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	610 620 625 630 640 650 650 650 670 710 720 730 740 790	Agriculture Other Food & Drug Drug Related Seizure of Propeny 21 USC Liquor Laws R.R. & Truck Airline Regs. Occupational Safety/Health Other LABOR Fair Labor Sundards Act	422 / 22 / 22 423 \cdot \c	Appeal 28 USC 158 Withdrawal 8 USC 157 PERTY RIGHTS Copyrights atent trad emark IAL SECURITY (1A (1395ff) Black Lung (923) DIW C/DIW W (405 (g)) SSD Tike XVI	400 State Reap portionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Alboation Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Act 900 Appeal of Fee Dustice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 890 Other Statutory Actions	
▼ Original □ 2 R	emoved from 3 tate Court	Remanded from 4 Appellate Court	Reopen	ted or □ 5 (specified	erred from r district y)	n □ 6 Multidisti Litigation	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON (Cite the U.S. Civil Sm Do not cite jurisdiction	tute under which you are fling a nal statutes unless diversity.)	ad write b	ief statement of cause.				
Federal Emplo	oyers Liabilit	y Act 45 U.S.C	. §§5	51-60 et se	q.			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C	S IS A CLASS ACTION P. 23	DEM	AND \$ 150,00	.00	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: AS Yes □ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	(See E(S) instructions):	IUDG			DOC	KET NUMBER		
2/9/05 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	NEV OF R					
	AMOUN	APPLYING IFP		MDGE		W. 6		

Additional Defendant:

CSX Transportation Inc. 3800 Centre Square West Philadelphia, PA 19102

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Catego	ory in whic	nich the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See	
	ule 40.1(a)	a)(1))	
	l.	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.	- 1/1/1
	16.	195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, 740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 840*, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950. *Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright cas	
X	III.	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.	
	ŧv.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660, 50, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.	
	V.	690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.	ojn C
Title an	d number	er, if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in ase indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court.	
Has a p	rior action	on between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court?	·
Does th	e complai §2403)	YES NO \overline{X} alnt in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See	
lf so, is	the U.S.A.	A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party?	
s this c	ase requir	YES NO X Ilred to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284? YES NO X	
Do <u>all</u> o Nassac IO.1(d)).	nuseus ("	ties. In this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule	
	A.	YES NO X If yes, in which division do_all of the non-governmental parties reside?	
		Eastern Division Central Division Western Division	
	В.	If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside?	
		Eastern Division X Western Division	
filing a es, sub	Notice of	of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court?(If parate sheet identifying the motions)	
TYPE C	R PRINT)	YES NO	
		chael J. McDevitt	
	son &	Weitzen, LLP 88 Black Falcon Ave., Ste. 345, Boston, MA 02210	